



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/698,954	10/31/2003	David DiFrancesco	021751-002150US	8801
68218 7590 07/14/2008 TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP/PIXAR TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834				
EXAMINER				
ANYIKIRE, CHIKAODILI E				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2621				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/14/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/698,954

Applicant(s)

DIFRANCESCO, DAVID

Examiner

CHIKAODILI E. ANYIKIRE

Art Unit

2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2003.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This application is responsive to application number (10698954) filed on October 31, 2003. Claims 1-35 are pending and have been examined.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. Acknowledgement is made of applicant's information disclosure statement.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claim 1-2, 12-13, 24, and 26 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ramsay et al (US 4,757,374, hereafter Ramsay).

As per **claim 1**, Ramsay discloses a film recorder comprises:

a film recording device (Fig 1, 11, and 12, element 32 (35 MM film camera))
configured to expose a frame of film media (Col 6 Ln 60-61 and Col 8 Ln 9-10);

at least one flat panel display device (Fig 11, element 45) configured to display at
least one color component image associated with an image (Col 3 Ln 67- Col 4 Ln 4;
the display is capable of displaying multiple colors of an image);

and an alignment unit (Fig 1, 11, element 26 and 27) coupled to the film
recording device (Fig 1, 11, and 12 element 32 (35 MM film camera)) and to the display

device (Fig 11, element 45; Col 3 Ln 22-31; the reference discloses using guiding rods to control the recording device and display device according to an specific alignment),

wherein the alignment unit (Fig 1, 11, element 26 and 27) is used to position an optical axis (Fig 1, o) of the flat panel display device (Fig 11, element 45; Col 3 Ln 22-31) with respect to an optical axis of the film recording device such that the film recording device (Fig 1, 11, and 12 element 32 (35 MM film camera)) can expose the film media to the plurality of images (Col 3 Ln 1-31 and Col 4 Ln 17-38 and Ln 67 – Col 5 Ln 5, Col 7 Ln 24-43, and Col 8 Ln 29-40).

As per **claim 2**, Ramsay discloses the film recorder of claim 1 further comprising an external illumination source configured to provide illumination to the one flat panel display;

wherein the external illumination source (Fig 11 element 115 and Fig 13 element 120) is one of the group: LED, strobe lamp, digital light projector (Col 4 Ln 62-66 and Col 7 Ln 53-57).

Regarding **claim 12**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 1 are applicable for claim 12.

Regarding **claim 13**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 2 are applicable for claim 13.

Regarding **claim 24**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 1 are applicable for claim 24.

Regarding **claim 26**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 2 are applicable for claim 26.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. Claim 3-11, 14-23, 25, and 27-35 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramsay et al (US 4,757,374, hereafter Ramsay) in view of Jones et al (US 2002/0163676, hereafter Jones) in view of well-known knowledge.

As per **claim 3**, Ramsey discloses the film recorder of claim 2 wherein the external illumination source comprises one or more digital light projectors (refer to claim 2).

However, Ramsey does not explicitly teach wherein the one or more digital light projectors project hex chromatic color space images.

In the same field of endeavor, Jones teaches wherein the one or more digital light projectors project hex chromatic color space images (paragraphs [0032], [0033], and [0044]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Ramsay with the plurality of displays of Jones. The advantage is displaying a broader range of colors, which leads to an optimal display environment is provided (paragraph [0033])

As per **claim 4**, Ramsay discloses the film recorder of claim 2.

However, Ramsay does not explicitly teach further comprising:

a second flat panel display device configured to display a second color component image associated with the image;

a third flat panel display device configured to display a third color component image associated with the image; and

an optical combiner coupled to the one flat panel display, to the second flat panel display, and to the third flat panel display, the optical combiner configured to optically combine the first color component image, the second color component image, and the third color component image to form a composite image.

In the same field of endeavor, Jones teaches a second flat panel display device configured to display a second color component image associated with the image (paragraphs [0032]-[0033]);

a third flat panel display device configured to display a third color component image associated with the image (paragraphs [0032]-[0033]); and

an optical combiner coupled to the one flat panel display, to the second flat panel display, and to the third flat panel display, the optical combiner configured to optically combine the first color component image, the second color component image, and the third color component image to form a composite image (paragraphs [0032]-[0033]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Ramsay with the plurality of displays of Jones. The advantage is displaying a broader range of colors, which leads to an optimal display environment is provided (paragraph [0033]).

As per **claim 5**, Ramsay discloses the film recorder of claim 4 wherein the film recording device exposes the frame of film media to the composite image (Col 6 Ln 60-61 and Col 8 Ln 9-10).

As per **claim 6**, Jones discloses the film recorder of claim 5 further comprising wherein the one flat panel display is monochromatic (paragraph [0033]).

As per **claim 7**, Ramsay discloses the film recorder of claim 4.

However, Ramsay does not explicitly teach further comprising a color filter coupled between the external illumination source and the one flat panel display, wherein the color filter is a color associated with a color component of the one color component image.

In the same field of endeavor, Jones teaches further comprising a color filter coupled between the external illumination source and the one flat panel display, wherein the color filter is a color associated with a color component of the one color component image (paragraph [0032]-[0033]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Ramsay with the plurality of displays of Jones. The advantage is displaying a broader range of colors, which leads to an optimal display environment is provided (paragraph [0033]).

Regarding **claim 8**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 4 are applicable for claim 8.

Regarding **claim 9**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 5 are applicable for claim 9.

Regarding **claim 10**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 7 are applicable for claim 10.

As per **claim 11**, the uses of LCDs are well-known to any one of ordinary skill in the art and therefore the examiner takes Official Notice. LCDs are common to flat-panel display and are advantageous because they provide low-cost and efficiency to display systems.

As per **claim 14**, Ramsay discloses the method of claim of claim 13 wherein the external illumination comprises more than one digital light projector (Fig 11 element 115 and Fig 13 element 120; Col 4 Ln 62-66 and Col 7 Ln 53-57).

However, Ramsay does not explicitly teach wherein the more than one digital light projector illuminate the one flat panel display with images in the RGB and CMY color space.

In the same field of endeavor, Jones teaches wherein the more than one digital light projector illuminate the one flat panel display with images in the RGB and CMY color space (paragraphs [0032], [0033], and [0044]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Ramsay with the plurality of displays of Jones. The advantage is displaying a broader range of colors, which leads to an optimal display environment is provided (paragraph [0033]).

Regarding **claim 15**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 5 are applicable for claim 15.

Regarding **claim 16**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 5 and 7 are applicable for claim 16.

Regarding **claim 17**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 11 are applicable for claim 17.

Regarding **claim 18**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 5 are applicable for claim 18.

Regarding **claim 19**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 4 are applicable for claim 19.

Regarding **claim 20**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 7 are applicable for claim 20.

As per **claim 21**, Jones discloses the method of claim 20 wherein the color is selected from the group: red, green, blue, cyan, yellow, magenta (paragraph [0034] Ln 1-6).

Regarding **claim 22**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 4 are applicable for claim 22.

As per **claim 23**, Ramsay discloses the method of claim 15 further comprising: making a release print in response to the film media (Col 6 Ln 60-61 and Col 8 Ln 9-10); and

displaying the release print to audience (Col 6 Ln 60-61 and Col 8 Ln 9-10).

Regarding **claim 25**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 11 are applicable for claim 25.

Regarding **claim 27**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 5 are applicable for claim 27

Regarding **claim 28**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 7 are applicable for claim 28.

Regarding **claim 29**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 21 are applicable for claim 29.

Regarding **claim 30**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 4 are applicable for claim 30.

Regarding **claim 31**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 4 and 7 are applicable for claim 31.

Regarding **claim 32**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 21 are applicable for claim 32.

Regarding **claim 33**, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 4 and 7 are applicable for claim 33.

Regarding **claim 34**, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 4 and 7 are applicable for claim 34.

Regarding **claim 35**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 14 are applicable for claim 35.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHIKAODILI E. ANYIKIRE whose telephone number is (571)270-1445. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 7:30 am to 5 pm, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha D. Banks-Harold can be reached on (571) 272 - 7905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Marsha D. Banks-Harold/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2621
/CEA/